

Case 4:10-cv-00014-HSM-CHS Document 44 Filed 09/10/12 Page 1 of 2 PageID #: 545

Magistrate Judge Carter's well-reasoned conclusions.<sup>1</sup> Additionally, because the parties are not diverse and because the Court will dismiss Plaintiffs' federal claims, the Court also agrees with Magistrate Judge Carter's conclusion that Plaintiffs' state law claims should be dismissed without prejudice.

Accordingly, the Court **ACCEPTS** and **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Carter's findings of fact and conclusions of law. Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (Doc. 24) is **DENIED**, and Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 26) is **GRANTED**. Plaintiffs' federal claims are hereby **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**. The Court declines to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' state law claims, and those claims are hereby **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

**SO ORDERED** this 10th day of September, 2012.

/s/ Harry S. Mattice, Jr.  
HARRY S. MATTICE, JR.  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> In fact, as Magistrate Judge Carter correctly noted, the Court has previously addressed the issue presented by Plaintiffs – namely, whether the City's Police Manual and Personnel Policy create a property interest in continued employment for the City's police officers – and concluded that no such property interest exists. *See Madden v. City of Dechard*, No. 4:10-cv-13 (E.D. Tenn., Mar. 27, 2012).